Catherine M. Cameron

HOPI DWELLINGS

Architectural Change at Orayvi

The University of Arizona Press / Tucson

The University of Arizona Press

First printing

♾ This book is printed on acid-free, archival-quality paper.
Manufactured in the United States of America

04 03 02 01 00 99 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Cameron, Catherine M.
Hopi dwellings : architectural change at Orayvi / Catherine M. Cameron.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8165-1781-9 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Hopi architecture—Arizona—Oraibi. 2. Hopi Indians—Dwellings—Arizona—Oraibi. 3. Vernacular architecture—Arizona—Oraibi. 4. Pueblos—Arizona—Oraibi. 5. Oraibi (Ariz.)—History. 6. Oraibi (Ariz.)—Social life and customs. I. Title.
E99.H7 C36 1999
720'.979135—dc21
98-40105
CIP

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Publication of this book is made possible in part by the proceeds of a permanent endowment created with the assistance of a Challenge Grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, a federal agency.

1989a:175; Ferguson and Mills 1987:251), also changed Hopi architectural styles.

U.S. government policy in the late nineteenth century was aimed at assimilating Indian populations into mainstream Euroamerican culture. One way of trying to achieve this goal was to educate Indian children in Euroamerican schools. Not surprisingly, many Hopi people were violently opposed to the education and Americanization of their children. In 1890, several Hopi chiefs, including Loololma of Orayvi, were taken to Washington, D.C., where they met President Benjamin Harrison. Loololma returned to Hopi apparently convinced that the Hopi must accommodate the requests of the U.S. government, and he agreed to persuade the people of Orayvi to send their children to school (but see Levy 1992:91–92 for evidence that Loololma was not sincere). His evident change of heart was greeted with great opposition by many people at Orayvi. Two factions developed, one that sided with Loololma and his support of White ways, and another that opposed him. Americans termed the first group the Friendlies, the second group the Hostiles (Titiev 1944:72–82; Whiteley 1988:74–83).

The Orayvi Split

The 1906 Orayvi split is the best-known example of village factionalism in the Southwest. Both Titiev (1944) and Whiteley (1988) have provided lengthy descriptions of the split, but they offer very different interpretations of the event. Other interpretations have also been suggested (Bernardini 1996; Bradfield 1971; Clemmer 1978; Hargrave 1932; Levy 1992; and Parsons 1922). Most authors, however, agree on the sequence of events leading up to and following the split. The following brief description of these events draws on both Titiev (1944:69–95) and Whiteley (1988:71–118). Contrasting interpretations of the split are then presented.

Conflicts between Hostiles and Friendlies increased in intensity during the 1890s and the early years of the twentieth century. Then, on September 7, 1906, the dispute climaxed. After the dramatic tug-of-war recounted in chapter 1, the Hostile faction, which included almost half the population of Orayvi, was forced out of the village.

The Hostiles camped the first night at springs seven kilometers north of Orayvi, at a place called Ho'atvela. They eventually founded a new village there. In November, after further disagreement among the Hostiles, many returned to Orayvi, but the returnees stayed for only three years (Whiteley 1988:6; Titiev [1944:212] erroneously reported the stay as one year), leaving again to found the village of Paaqavi near Ho'atvela. Economic problems and further discord at Orayvi (Bradfield 1971:30) caused subsequent, gradual migration of many Friendlies to Kiqotsmovi (New Orayvi), at the foot of Third Mesa, and to Munqapi, a farming village twenty miles west (Titiev 1944:94). The factionalism that climaxed with the split continues to be a major sociological force on Third Mesa today (Clemmer 1978; Wyckoff 1985).

The causes of the factional split have been variously described as the result of social or economic factors. Orayvi's large population is often considered a catalyst. Clemmer (1978:58, 76) and others (Hargrave 1932:7; Parsons 1922:283) suggest that the split was caused by tensions resulting from acculturative pressure on the Hopi by the U.S. government. Although battle lines between Hostiles and Friendlies were defined in terms of U.S.–Hopi conflict, others see underlying causes for the split. Titiev (1944:69, 99) suggests that the matrilineal clans that compose Hopi society were only loosely combined into villages and that large pueblos, like Orayvi, were operating with social systems better adapted to much smaller communities. Under these circumstances, the potential for division was ever-present (see Nagata 1977 for another example of factionalism at a Hopi village). Titiev (1944:99) believes the dispute between Hostiles and Friendlies over the education of Hopi children and the adoption of American culture was symptomatic of a division that was in some ways inevitable. Bernardini's (1996) study makes essentially the same argument, applying the term "scalar stress" to the problems of information flow at the large pueblo. Bernardini suggests that population increase at Orayvi during the late nineteenth century multiplied problems of information flow (1996:380).

In a study of Hopi agriculture, Bradfield (1971) observed that in the years just prior to 1906, the main wash in the Orayvi Valley began a period of severe entrench-

ment that destroyed one-third of the farmland available to Orayvi farmers. He suggests that the split occurred because the large Orayvi population could no longer be supported by the available agricultural land (Bradfield 1971:23). The division of the village alleviated this problem. In a postscript to his manuscript, Bradfield quotes informants who date the erosion of the Orayvi wash to after the split (Bradfield 1971:45; see also Hack 1942:47). Bradfield still maintains, however, that poor climate between 1892 and 1904 put an economic strain on Orayvi residents that resulted in the split.

Whiteley (1988) has offered a third explanation for the split: that it was the result of a deliberate plot by leaders of Orayvi (see Clemmer 1978 and Levy 1992 for different interpretations of this theory). The split had been foretold in prophecies and was necessary for the overturn of the politico-religious order, which, in the eyes of some Orayvi leaders, had become corrupt. Whiteley offers this "ethnosociological" analysis as the primary explanation for the Orayvi split but suggests that other social and economic factors may also have been important.

In a major reanalysis of the Orayvi split, Levy (1992) proposes that because of an uncertain environment, Hopi had evolved a stratified social system based on unequal access to agricultural land by clans. During times of scarcity, low-status clans were cast off (for critiques of the argument see Bernardini 1996:380 and Whiteley 1994). Levy presents evidence for population increase at Orayvi and discusses the encroachment of Navajos and Anglos on available agricultural land. He demonstrates that the Hostiles were primarily drawn from low-status clans, and he ties their departure to the economic distress caused by a large population facing drought and other environmental problems that occurred during the late 1800s and early 1900s. He calls the split a "flight of the landless" (1992: 95). Levy also believes that the strong and unbending personalities of some of the Orayvi leaders caused the intensity and anguish of the split (1992:153–54). Without these individuals, many people might still have left Orayvi but in a more orderly fashion, as was already happening with the settlement of the farming village of Munqapi.

As a result of the 1906 split, the population of Orayvi was almost halved; 298 of the 622 adults left the village (Titiev 1944:87). Using Bradfield's (1971:43) formula of nine children for every twenty adults, a total of 432 individuals left; these individuals represented forty-eight entire households and parts of other households (Titiev 1944:89). In subsequent years, households continued to leave, drifting off to Kiqotsmovi, Munqapi, or elsewhere. Titiev (1944:95) reports only 112 people in Orayvi in 1933; Stubbs (1950:117) estimates 87 people in 1932.

The split and subsequent population decline had a dramatic impact on architecture in the village. Many structures at Orayvi were abandoned and began to disintegrate rapidly. Within a few decades, many of the original roomblocks had been completely dismantled, and large parts of many others were in ruins. By 1948, aerial photographs show that only twelve of the original twenty-five roomblocks remained, although several small groups of rooms had been added. These transformations are discussed in chapter 6.

The History of Research at Orayvi

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century, Orayvi has been visited by numerous artists, writers, photographers, anthropologists, museum curators, and other scholars. A fairly large literature on Orayvi exists, dealing especially with the Snake Dance and the 1906 factional split (Laird 1977), and numerous photographs are available in archives. In this section, five projects will be described in some detail, as they produced materials (including maps and census data) used in the present study. These are (1) the Bureau of American Ethnology's 1887 mapping project under Victor Mindeleff; (2) the 1900 United States Census; (3) the Carnegie Institution and National Geographic Society's Second Beam Expedition; (4) Mischa Titiev's anthropological study of Orayvi in 1932–34; and (5) Jerrold Levy's (1990, 1992) study of Orayvi social stratification.

The Bureau of American Ethnology Mapping Project

In 1881, Victor and Cosmos Mindeleff, brothers aged twenty-one and nineteen, were part of a Bureau of Ameri-